

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Claims 1-44 were pending in this application and examined.

Claims 14, 28, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,503), ("Cooper") in view of Sweet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,278 B1) ("Sweet").

Claims 1, 5-8, 13-15, 19-22, 27-29, 33-36, 41, and 42 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Claims 1-44 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment.

INTERVIEW

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Chongshan Chen and Examiner Jean Corrielus for the telephonic interview regarding this application conducted on March 29, 2005. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiners. A "Statement of Substance of the Interview" is being filed with this amendment.

THE CLAIMS

Rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 14, 28, and 42

The use of different selection techniques for determining relevancy of CPIOs to UDIOs was explained to the Examiner during the telephonic interview (with reference to Fig. 6 of the application). To further clarify the use of different selection techniques and as suggested by the Examiner, claims 14, 18, and 42 have been amended to identify two selection techniques that may be included in the "plurality of selection techniques".

As explained to the Examiner during the telephonic interview, one unique feature of the claimed invention is that a selection technique can compare and find relevancy between objects of different types. For example, relevancy of an audio object to a text object may be determined using a selection techniques (e.g., according to one selection technique, a transcription of the audio object may be obtained and compared to a text object to find the relevancy between the objects).

In light of the above, Applicant submits that the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of a Sweet.

As explained to the Examiner during the telephonic interview, one of the unique features of the invention recited in claim 1 is that objects of different types can be compared to determine a degree of relevancy between the objects. For example, an audio object may be compared to a text object (or an image object may be compared to a video object, etc.) to determine a degree of relevancy of the audio object to the text object.

The above unique feature has been recited in claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites that the "first set of information objects" (i.e., objects extracted from the first document) comprises a "first information object" comprising information of a "first type". Claim 1 further recites that the first information object is one of an audio object, a video object, or an image object. Claim 1 also recites that the second set of information objects comprises at least one information object comprising information of a second type, wherein the second type is different from the first type. For example, if the first information object is an audio object comprising audio information, then the second information object comprises information other than audio information--the second information object may be a text object, image object, etc.

Claim 1 goes on to recite that determining the degree of relevancy information for the second set of information objects comprises determining a degree of relevancy of the "at least

one information object" (which comprises information of the second type) to the "first information object" (which comprises information of the first type) and is an audio object, a video object, or an image object. In this manner, claim 1 recites that a degree of relevancy is determined between the objects comprising information of different types. For example, relevancy may be determined between an audio object and a text object.

Applicant submits that the above concept is not taught or suggested by Cooper or Sweet, considered individually or in combination. Cooper describes techniques for identifying concepts in a document to a user. These concepts are represented by multiple words. A search engine is used that accesses one or more selected documents from a plurality of documents. A markup engine selects selected words in each of one or more of the selected documents. The selected words, often multiple word/concepts, are selected because they are repeated in one of the documents and because that meet a grammatical criteria. Each selected word is marked in the document with a marker. The active markers can then be used to launch additional searches or display related information. Cooper thus describes techniques for identifying terms to be used in refinements of search queries and recognition and markup of terms in document where the terms may not be contained in the original search query provided by the user. (See Cooper: Objects of the Invention section, Summary section).

However, Applicant submits that Cooper does not teach an audio object, a video object, or an image object that are extracted from a document. Further, Cooper also does not teach or suggest determining relevancy between objects comprising information of different types as recited in claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the deficiencies of Cooper are not cured by Sweet. Sweet describes techniques for retrieving documents transitively linked to an initial document. Sweet describes extracting objects from a HTML document (in col. 3 lines 2-5 identified by the Office Action). However, Sweet fails to teach or even suggest determining relevancy between objects comprising information of different types as recited in claim 1. For example, Sweet does not teach determining relevancy between an audio object and an image object.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that neither of the references cites the feature of determining relevancy between objects comprising information of different types as recited in

claim 1. Thus, even if Cooper and Sweet were combined (even though there appears to be no motivation for the combination) as suggested in the Office Action, the resultant combination would not disclose the feature of determining a degree of relevancy between two objects comprising information of different types where one of the objects is an audio object, a video object, or an image object.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over a combination of Cooper and Sweet.

Claims 2-13, 15-27, and 29-41

Applicant submits that independent claims 15 and 29 should be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others.

Applicants submit that claims 2-13, 16-27, and 30-41 which depend from claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively, should also be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claims 1, 15, and 29, and others. Many of the dependent claims recite additional features which, contrary to what is stated in the Office Action, are also not taught or suggested by the cited references thus making the claims patentable for additional reasons.

Claims 14, 28, and 42-44

Applicant submits that claims 14, 28, and 42, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the Cooper or Sweet, considered individually or in combination. In addition to other features, neither Cooper nor Sweet teaches or suggests "a first selection technique" and "a second selection technique" as recited in claims 14, 28, and 42. Claims 43 and 44 that depend from claim 44 are in a condition for allowance for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 42, and others.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/905,036
Amdt. dated April 12, 2005
Examining Group 2162

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

S. B. Kotwal

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:km
60413377 v1